

### **Remarks**

Claims 28-63 were pending prior to this amendment and claims 64 to 74 are pending after entry of the amendment. In order to move this case towards allowance, applicants, via their new attorney, have prepared original claims 1-3 that have been examined with added features from the specification, as new independent claims, with dependent claims thereon, as detailed in a claim chart below. No new matter has been added.

### ***Contents of New Claims***

<b>Claim</b>	<b>From Filed Claims</b>	<b>Added Material</b>
64	Claim 1, with claim 7 (UV adhesive) and claim 8 (1/20 <sup>th</sup> thickness...)	the optically anisotropic crystal plate and the substrate are respectively set to the thickness of at least 100 $\mu\text{m}$ and less than 100 $\mu\text{m}$ (see for example paragraph 4, line 6 and paragraph 3)
65	Claim 2, with claim 7 (UV adhesive) and claim 8 (1/20 <sup>th</sup> thickness)	the optically anisotropic crystal plate and the substrate are respectively set to the thickness of at least 100 $\mu\text{m}$ and less than 100 $\mu\text{m}$ (see for example paragraph 4, line 6 and paragraph 3)
66	Claim 3, with claim 7 (UV adhesive) and claim 8 (1/20 <sup>th</sup> thickness)	the optically anisotropic crystal plate and the substrate are respectively set to the thickness of at least 100 $\mu\text{m}$ and less than 100 $\mu\text{m}$ (see for example paragraph 4, line 6 and paragraph 3)
67	Claim 9	
68	Claim 9	
69	Claim 9	
70	Claim 4	the optically anisotropic crystal plate is a crystal plate, and the substrate is selected from the group consisting of a glass substrate, a resin substrate and a

		transparent substrate. (paragraph 0063)
71	Claims 5, 14 and 15	
72	Claims 6, 16 and 17	
73	Claims 10, 24 and 25	
74	Claims 11, 26 and 27	

**The 35 USC 103 Obviousness Rejections**

The office action, pages 2-5, rejected claims on obviousness grounds over Nakasendou in view of Morikawa.

The claims now recite "thickness of at least 100  $\mu\text{m}$  and less than 500  $\mu\text{m}$ ." This claim element is missing from the references. Reconsideration and allowance therefore respectfully are requested.

Furthermore, Nakasendou does not disclose the use of a UV adhesive for an optical filter, and Morikawa merely discloses a thickness of a UV adhesive (e.g. 1.0 to 2.5  $\mu\text{m}$ ) without any further relevant teaching. Still further, Morikawa uses an adhesive in order to adhere a resin film, and not to stick a substrate and an optically anisotropic crystal plate that are harder and thicker than a film, as now recited in the pending claims. The claimed invention thus concerns items that are joined by adhesive that have totally different hardnesses and thicknesses.

In particular, the flexible film (resin film) of Morikawa is a substrate that has no strength and, if the UV adhesive is applied to this film, merely the act of curing the adhesive will deform the film. This is totally unsuitable and it is impossible to obtain a flat substrate having a flat surface to form an optical filter this way. Thus, a skilled artisan could not have obtained any result from this combination of applying the cited art 1/20 thickness of the UV adhesive to the cited art flexible film.

The Examiner applies the adhesive of Morikawa to the feature of Nakasendou and rejected the previously pending claims. However, Nakasendou discloses a glass substrate 21 of a thickness of about 5 mm (see paragraph [0007]), and the graph of Fig. 3 indicates the glass substrate 21 has a thickness of at least 0.5 mm. On the other hand, Morikawa concerns adhesion of a resin film as described above.

Because the cited art lacks the combination of UV adhesive of "no more than 1/20 the thickness" and additionally lacks the recited minimum thicknesses, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Applicants further emphasize that Morikawa's technique cannot be used for adhesion of the optically anisotropic crystal plate and the substrate as now claimed. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Entry of the claim amendments, reconsideration and allowance earnestly are requested. If a telephone conversation can facilitate disposition of this case, the Examiner cordially is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 202-828-1008.

Respectfully submitted,



Marvin A. Motsenbocker

Registration No.: 36,614

Date: March 12, 2009

MOTS LAW, PLLC

Customer No.: 65181

1629 K Street N.W., Suite 602

Washington, DC 20006-1635

Telephone: 202-828-1008

Facsimile: 202-478-2237